DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3017/307734.01
Application No.: 10/828,947
Office Action Dated: April 19, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

## REMARKS

This communication is in response to an Official Action dated 4/19/2007.

Claims 1-12, 14, 22-24, and 27 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 22 are independent. Claims 1 and 7 are amended herewith.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 4-6, 8-12, 14, 22-24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The outstanding rejections are respectfully traversed.


### Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 7 were rejected as anticipated by Pub. No. US 2002/0124213 A1 (Ahrens). Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) require that a single reference teach each and every element of the rejected claim. Ahrens does not teach or suggest, for example, linking said list of operating systems to said representative test failure in said database, as required by independent claims 1 and 7.

The Official Action alleges that this limitation is disclosed in Ahrens 0049 and 0051. Ahrens 0049 provides a standardized format to report error events, including a number of fields. Field 502 is an operating system identifier.

However, Ahrens 0051 states, "[i]f an event log entry has already been logged, a counter is incremented to indicate the number of times an error log entry is received for this particular error event. If no error event log entry has already been logged, this event log entry will be logged."

The above statement in Ahrens 0051 clearly demonstrates that Ahrens does NOT link a list of operating systems to a representative test failure. Instead, Ahrens merely increments a counter in a previously logged error. Indeed, the above indicates that Ahrens foregoes logging error information entirely when the error was previously logged by another operating system.

Furthermore, while Ahrens does maintain a single operating system identifier in an event log, this single identifier cannot be said to disclose a "list of operating systems" as required by the claim. A previous claim limitation in Applicants' claim 1 requires the "list of operating systems correspond[s] to said representative test failure and said at least one related

test failure." Therefore, the list must correspond to multiple related failures, and the single

operating system identifier disclosed in Ahrens clearly does not do so.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and claim 7 is a corresponding computer

readable medium claim, and so claims 2-3 and 7 define over Ahrens for the same reasons.

### Rejection of Claims 4-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4-6 also depend from claim 1. Because the U.S. Pat. 6,438,716 (Snover) fails

to cure the deficiency of Ahrens, claims 4-6 define over the references for the same reasons.

### Rejection of Claims 8-11 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over

Ahrens in view of U.S. Pat. 7,058,860 (Miller).

Independent claim 8 requires *"linking an operating system identification from said*

*test result file to said failure characteristics if said data from a test result file matches said*

*failure characteristics."*

Similar to the above discussed aspect of claims 1 and 7, this limitation defines over

Ahrens – in this case because Ahrens does not link operating system data to failure

characteristics *if said data from a test result file matches said failure characteristics.* Ahrens

merely maintains an error log that always has an operating system identifier field. Ahrens

does not conditionally link the operating system identifier to other information, such as

failure characteristics, as required by the claim.

Miller fails to cure the deficiency of Ahrens. Claims 9-11 and 14 depend from claim 8

and therefore define over the references of record for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the

rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims 12, 22-24, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 12, 22-24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious

over Ahrens in view of Miller and further in view of U.S. Pat. 6,438,716 (Snover).

Claim 12 depends from claim 8 and defines over the references for the reasons set

forth above.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3017/307734.01
Application No.: 10/828,947
Office Action Dated: April 19, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

Similar to the above discussed limitations of claims 1, 7, and 8, independent claim 22 requires, "*adding said operating system identifier to a list of operating system identifiers associated with said single failure.*" Neither Ahrens, Miller, nor Snover disclose a list of operating system identifiers associated with a single failure. Claims 23, 24, and 27 depend from claim 22 and therefore define over the reference for the same reason.

### Conclusion

Applicants thank the Examiner for his work and respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and allowance of the application in view of these amendments and remarks.

Date: June 19, 2007

/Nathaniel Gilder/
Nathaniel Gilder
Registration No. 53,233

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439